



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/720,069	04/10/2001	Tsuyoshi Hayashi		8817

7590

03/16/2006

Tsuyoshi Hayashi
Flat Isogo 201 13 19
Nakahara 2 Chome Isogo Ku
Yokohama Shi
Kanagawa, 235-0 036
JAPAN

EXAMINER

PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/720,069	Applicant(s) HAYASHI, TSUYOSHI	
	Examiner Ashok B. Patel	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/28/2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/28/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Application Number 09/720, 069 was filed on 04/10/2001. Claims 1-15 are subject to examination. Claim 2 has been cancelled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/28/2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. The reply filed on 12/28/2005 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): See 37 CFR 1.111.

A. Applicant should submit an argument under the heading "Remarks" pointing out disagreements with the examiner's contentions. Applicant must also discuss the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them.

4. An examination of this application reveals that applicant is unfamiliar with patent prosecution procedure. While an inventor may prosecute the application, lack of skill in this field usually acts as a liability in affording the maximum protection for the invention disclosed. Applicant is advised to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or agent to prosecute the application, since the value of a patent is largely dependent upon

skilled preparation and prosecution. The Office cannot aid in selecting an attorney or agent.

A listing of registered patent attorneys and agents is available on the USPTO Internet web site <http://www.uspto.gov> in the Site Index under "Attorney and Agent Roster." Applicants may also obtain a list of registered patent attorneys and agents located in their area by writing to the Mail Stop OED, Director of the U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Appropriate correction is required.

a. A substitute specification including the claims is required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.125(a) because the specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact and includes numerous grammatical and spelling errors.

A substitute specification filed under 37 CFR 1.125(a) must only contain subject matter from the original specification and any previously entered amendment under 37 CFR 1.121. If the substitute specification contains additional subject matter not of record, the substitute specification must be filed under 37 CFR 1.125(b) and (c).

b. A substitute specification in proper idiomatic English and in compliance with 37 CFR 1.52(a) and (b) is required. The substitute specification filed must be accompanied by a statement that it contains no new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter where:

a. Claims must not be directed merely to an abstract idea, but must instead be tied to a technological art, environment, or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful and tangible result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 3-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being Unpatentable over Haverstock et al. (hereinafter Haverstock) (US 6,192,415) in view of Nakai et al. (hereinafter Nakai) (US 6,253,248).

Referring to claim 1,

The reference Haverstock teaches a character string processing means which carries out a processing by using at least a URL path part of data which said conventional WWW server stores in a memory means (Fig.1, server 14). The reference also teaches a branch processing means which makes the process branch off from said conventional

Art Unit: 2154

WWW server into said character string processing means (Fig. 1, Non-HTML Server Module 24, col.5, lines 19-51). The reference also teaches the URL parsing capability of interface module 32 which includes identifying non-HTML actions and arguments in the URL allowing the system users to retrieve objects and identify actions with a single input command without requiring program code (col.5, lines 41-44). The reference Haverstock fails to teach an error inducing means for intentionally causing an error when a conventional WWW server processes a URL. The reference Nakai teaches having the error inducing means when the requested file is not present which also includes the message indicating the absence of file. (col.10, lines 3-6). The reference also teaches request interpreting execution unit (Fig.1, element 102) for exchanging the data with servers to satisfy a request from the client. (col.3, lines 33-37). The reference also teaches the capability of the proxy server which incorporates the request interpreting execution unit implementing protocol conversion by adding appropriate information even when a request from a client does not include any information required for the protocol conversion and its method. (col.2, lines 18-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Haverstock' URL parsing capability to separate the URL host part from URL path part and branch off from conventional server by locating Nakai's proxy server with it's request interpreting execution unit and it's error generating capability either as part of Haverstock's server or as an interface between the client and Haverstock's server such that the automatic error is generated with each URL processing. This system enables a server not only to respond to URL requests containing action commands and

Art Unit: 2154

arguments but also retrieving the server objects and performing the commanded operations on the objects as taught by Haverstock and by recognizing the characters such as Kanji codes in a URL as taught by Nakai.

Referring to claims 3 and 4

The reference Haverstock teaches the claimed element.(col.5, lines 19-39).

Referring to claims 5 and 6,

The reference Haverstock teaches the invention that overcomes the drawbacks of CGI. Thus it teaches that the Haverstock's system does not use the CGI. (col.2, lines 38-55). The reference also teaches URL path part containing the client-side inputted character string. (col.5, lines 19-39). The reference Haverstock fails to teach the URL path part of client-side inputted character string containing Kanji, Hiragana or katakana . The reference Nakai teaches request interpreting execution unit (Fig.1, element 102) for exchanging the data with servers to satisfy a request from the client. (col.3, lines 33-37). The reference also teaches the capability of the proxy server which incorporates the request interpreting execution unit implementing protocol conversion by adding appropriate information even when a request from a client does not include any information required for the protocol conversion and its method. (col.2, lines 18-24). The reference goes on teaching that the proxy server does Kanji code conversion, and also, the proxy server determines the protocol on the basis of data in a URL contained in a request from a client. (col.1, lines 33-60). Therefore, it teaches that the URL path can be provided to the Nakai's system with Kanji, Hiragana or Katakana. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention

Art Unit: 2154

was made to enhance Haverstock's URL parsing capability to separate the URL host part from URL path part which includes Kanji, Hiragana or Katakana by locating Nakai's proxy server with it's code conversion capability as an interface between the client and Haverstock's server such that the URL path can be parsed from the URL strings and processed appropriately. This system enables a server not only to respond to URL requests containing HTML documents but also retrieving the server objects and performing the commanded operations by recognizing the characters such as Kanji codes in a URL containing non-HTML documents as taught by Haverstock.

Referring to claim 7,

The reference Haverstock teaches the claimed element.(Abstract).

Referring to claim 8,

The reference Haverstock teaches the claimed element.(col.5, lines 28-40).

Referring to claim 9,

The reference Haverstock teaches the claimed element by stating "http://www.companya.com/sales.nsf/east/john?opendoc" which uses "?" character in URL path which is given special meaning by RFCs.(col.5, lines 31-32) which is processed as an action command and argument.

Referring to claims 10 and 11,

The reference Haverstock teaches a character string processing means which carries out a processing by using at least a URL, path part of data which said conventional WWW server stores in a memory means (Fig.1, server 14). The reference also teaches a branch processing means which makes the process branch off from said conventional

Art Unit: 2154

WWW server into said character string processing means (Fig. 1, Non-HTML Server Module 24, col.5, lines 19-51). The reference also teaches the URL parsing capability of interface module 32 which includes identifying non-HTML actions and arguments in the URL allowing the system users to retrieve objects and identify actions with a single input command without requiring program code (col.5, lines 41-44). The reference also teaches an external information processing means which carries out a processing outside said existent information processing means using a part or all of the information processing results obtained by said existent information processing means.(Fig.1, Non-HTML Server Module 24, Non-HTML database 16). The reference also teaches that all URL requests are transmitted to the interface module 32 via URL interface 46 of Fig. 1. (col.3, lines 55-67) which parses the URL to determine actions commands and arguments (col.5, lines 52-55), thus the reference teaches that the interface module 32 serves as condition modifying means. The reference Haverstock fails to teach an error inducing means for intentionally causing an error when an existent information processing means carries out information processing. The reference Nakai teaches having the error inducing means when the requested file is not present which also includes the message indicating the absence of file. (col.10, lines 3-6). The reference also teaches request interpreting execution unit (Fig.1, element 102) for exchanging the data with servers to satisfy a request from the client. (col.3, lines 33-37). The reference also teaches the capability of the proxy server which incorporates the request interpreting execution unit implementing protocol conversion by adding appropriate information even when a request from a client does not include any information required

Art Unit: 2154

for the protocol conversion and its method. (col.2, lines 18-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to enhance Haverstock' URL parsing capability to separate the URL host part from URL path part which includes action commands and arguments by additionally locating Nakai's proxy server with it's request interpreting execution unit and it's error generating capability either as part of Haverstock's server or as an interface between the client and Haverstock's server such that the automatic error is generated with conditions based on the URL path action commands and arguments with each URL processing. This system enables a server not only to respond to URL requests containing action commands and arguments but also retrieving the server objects and performing the commanded operations by recognizing the characters such as Kanji codes in a URL.

Referring claim 12,

Claim 12 is a claim to the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 12 is rejected for the reasons set forth in above paragraph for claim 1.

Referring claim 13,

Claim 13 is a claim to a recording medium recorded with a function expanding program which performs the steps of the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 13 is rejected for the reasons set forth in above paragraph for claim 1.

Referring to claim 14,

The reference Haverstock teaches a function expanding device comprising an external information processing means which carries out a processing outside said existent information processing means using a part or all of the information processing results

Art Unit: 2154

obtained by said existent information processing means when an existent information processing means carries out information processing (Fig.1, elements 14, 16, 18)., and a branch processing means which makes the process branch off from said existent information processing means into the external information processing means as follows: The reference Haverstock teaches a character string processing means which carries out a processing by using at least a URL path part of data which said conventional WWW server stores in a memory means (Fig.1, server 14). The reference also teaches a branch processing means which makes the process branch off from said conventional WWW server into said character string processing means (Fig. 1, Non-HTML Server Module 24, col.5, lines 19-51). The reference also teaches the URL parsing capability of interface module 32 which includes identifying non-HTML actions and arguments in the URL allowing the system users to retrieve objects and identify actions with a single input command without requiring program code (col.5, lines 41-44). The reference Haverstock fails to teach an error inducing means for intentionally causing an error when a conventional WWW server processes a URL. The reference Nakai teaches having the error inducing means when the requested file is not present which also includes the message indicating the absence of file. (col.10, lines 3-6). The reference also teaches request interpreting execution unit (Fig.1, element 102) for exchanging the data with servers to satisfy a request from the client. (col.3, lines 33-37). The reference also teaches the capability of the proxy server which incorporates the request interpreting execution unit implementing protocol conversion by adding appropriate information even when a request from a client does not include any

Art Unit: 2154

information required for the protocol conversion and its method (col.2, lines 18-24), and teaches that the proxy server can be located anywhere, internally to the client machine or on different machine. (col.4, lines 63-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Haverstock' URL parsing capability to separate the URL host part from URL path part and branch off from conventional server by locating Nakai's proxy server with it's request interpreting execution unit and it's error generating capability either as part of Haverstock's server or as an interface between the client and Haverstock's server such that the automatic error is generated with each URL processing. This system enables a server not only to respond to URL requests containing action commands and arguments but also retrieving the server objects and performing the commanded operations on the objects as taught by Haverstock and by recognizing the characters such as Kanji codes in a URL as taught by Nakai.

Referring to claim 15,

The reference Haverstock teaches a character string processing means which carries out a processing by using at least a URL path part of data which said conventional WWW server stores in a memory means (Fig.1, server 14). The reference also teaches a branch processing means which makes the process branch off from said conventional WWW server into said character string processing means (Fig. 1, Non-HTML Server Module 24, col.5, lines 19-51). The reference also teaches the URL parsing capability of interface module 32 which includes identifying non-HTML actions and arguments in the URL allowing the system users to retrieve objects and identify actions with a single

Art Unit: 2154

input command without requiring program code (col.5, lines 41-44). The reference Haverstock fails to teach an error inducing means for intentionally causing an error when a conventional WWW server processes a URL. The reference Nakai teaches having the error inducing means when the requested file is not present which also includes the message indicating the absence of file. (col.10, lines 3-6). The reference also teaches request interpreting execution unit (Fig.1, element 102) for exchanging the data with servers to satisfy a request from the client. (col.3, lines 33-37). The reference also teaches the capability of the proxy server which incorporates the request interpreting execution unit implementing protocol conversion by adding appropriate information even when a request from a client does not include any information required for the protocol conversion and its method. (col.2, lines 18-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify Haverstock' URL parsing capability to separate the URL host part from URL path part and branch off from conventional server by locating Nakai's proxy server with it's request interpreting execution unit and it's error generating capability either as part of Haverstock's server or as an interface between the client and Haverstock's server such that the automatic error is generated with each URL processing. This system enables a server not only to respond to URL requests containing action commands and arguments but also retrieving the server objects and performing the commanded operations on the objects as taught by Haverstock and by recognizing the characters such as Kanji codes in a URL as taught by Nakai.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok B. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abp


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100